

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 26, 2004. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 are in independent form. Claims 25-32 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be mentioned further. Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-21, 23 and 24 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Initially, the specification and the abstract have been amended as to matters of form, in response to the objections made to the specification and to the abstract in the Office Action. Withdrawal of those objections is respectfully requested.

In addition, in response to the objection made to the drawing, replacement sheets for Figs. 47 and 49-51 are submitted herewith, in which --print setting-- has been used in place of "scan setting", to conform these Figures to the specification. Withdrawal of the drawing objection is also respectfully requested.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, for improper antecedent basis. The discrepancy kindly noted by the Examiner has been corrected.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,567,180 (Kageyama et al.), Claims 5-8, 13-16 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,740,496 (Kawabuchi), and Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kageyama* in view of *Kawabuchi*.

As is discussed in the specification, the present invention is concerned with mitigating or eliminating a problem that has become more serious with the spread of multi-function office machines, such as apparatuses that can serve as copiers, printers and fax machines. In conventional office machinery, it is possible to terminate execution of a job that is being performed, such as by depressing a button that halts execution. If only one function is available, and only one job is actually being executed, this arrangement may be quite satisfactory. In multi-function machines, however, if the user is afforded the ability to select a particular job for termination, from among those for which instructions have been entered, the time required for the user to make the selection may result in an undesirable waste of materials, as the job being executed continues while the user is making the selection. The present invention provides a solution to this problem.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus which can accept and parallelly execute a plurality of jobs, and that comprises a stop key for instructing to stop a job during job execution, and a display unit for displaying a list showing plural jobs including a job in execution and a job waiting execution in response to a depression of the stop key by a user. A console allows the user to select any of the jobs in the list displayed on the display unit, and a controller, when the user instructs to cancel a selected job using the console, cancels the selected job.

Among other important features of the apparatus constructed invention according to Claim 1, 5, 8, and 13 is that a job selected from among a number of jobs including a job that is being executed and a job that is awaiting execution, can be canceled in response to a

depression of a stop key by a user. According to this feature, a user can select to cancel any one of the jobs, including the job that is currently in execution and a job that is awaiting execution in the displayed list.

Kageyama relates to a printing system including a computer and a printer connected to the computer. The aim of *Kageyama* is to provide a print system having improved ease of use without deterioration in picture quality of a document image and having increased freedom in edition for the document. To attain this object, the printer is directed to print and store a document prepared by the computer. The printer stores the received document not in dot image form but in PDL form. Fig. 13 shows a user interface for instructing the spool control service section 2110 to refer the order of stored print jobs, and to delete the print jobs or the like (col. 8, lines 36-45).

However, Applicant submits that nothing in *Kageyama* suggests, or even hints, that the list shown in Fig. 13 is displayed in response to depression of a stop key. Unlike the apparatus of Claim 1, whose purpose is to permit a user selectively to cancel any one of plural jobs, including a job currently being executed and one or more jobs awaiting execution, the purpose of the *Kageyama* system is to direct some action to the spooled jobs from the computer. Thus, it is not seen how one of merely ordinary skill could possibly have derived from *Kageyama* even the most remote suggestion to produce an apparatus having the features recited in Claim 1, and that claim is believed to be clearly allowable over *Kageyama*.

Moreover, the job list in the *Kageyama* apparatus reflects spooled jobs stored in the printer. This does not in any way suggest a list which, like that of Claim 1, is displayed in

response to a depression of a stop key to cancel a selected job from jobs including a job in execution as well as a job waiting execution.

For all these reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Kageyama*.

The foregoing arguments apply to Claims 9 and 17 as well,, and those claims are also deemed clearly allowable over *Kageyama*.

Independent Claim 5 is directed to an image processing apparatus which can accept and parallelly execute a plurality of jobs. The apparatus of Claim 5 comprises a stop key for instruction to stop a job during job execution, and a display unit for displaying a list showing plural jobs including a job in execution and job waiting execution in response to a depression of the stop key by a user. A discrimination unit discriminates a currently set stop mode when a user requests to stop a job by depressing the stop key, and a controller stops a job in accordance with the stop mode discriminated by the discrimination unit, the controller cancelling a job selected from the plural jobs displayed by the display unit..

Kawabuchi relates to an image forming apparatus which performs scanning and printing in parallel. When a stop key is depressed while a scanning job and a printing job are being performed in parallel, a selection window allows a user to select one of those jobs to be canceled, and the selected job is canceled. Accordingly, if the user depresses the stop key, only the selected job is canceled; however, this occurs *without* all the jobs that are being executed, being stopped or paused, and any jobs that are awaiting execution are apparently unaffected.

Nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Kawabuchi* that would teach or

suggest any arrangement that would make it possible for a user to select among all jobs that are either being executed or awaiting execution, not just those currently being executed, for cancellation, as recited in Claim 5.

Moreover, nothing has been found or pointed out in *Kawabuchi* that would teach or suggest a display unit that displays a list showing plural jobs including both job being executed and a job awaiting execution, in response to a depression of a stop key by a user. The *Kawabuchi* system displays only jobs that are being executed. For all these reasons, Claim 5 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Kawabuchi*.

Independent Claims 13 and 21 are also deemed allowable over that patent for at least the same reasons as are presented above with regard to Claim 5.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Leonard P. Diana". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 460184v1